

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed April 11, 2005. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the Application. Although Applicants believe all claims are allowable without amendment, Applicants have made clarifying amendments to Claims 1-3, 5, 8 and 15. Applicants have also canceled Claims 16-17. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims in view of the following remarks.

I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants have amended Claims 1, 8 and 15 in such a way that renders these rejections moot.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)/103(a)

Claims 1-6, 8-12 and 15-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,502,236 to Allen et al. ("*Allen*"). Claims 7 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Allen* in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,493,868 to DaSilva ("*DaSilva*"), and Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Allen*. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons stated below.

Applicants respectfully submit that each and every limitation of amended Independent Claims 1, 8, and 15 are not found within the *Allen* and/or *DaSilva* references. For example, in Claim 1, neither *Allen* nor *DaSilva* teaches or suggests, "validating specific field conversion options of the conversion routine," and in Claim 8, neither *Allen* nor *DaSilva* teaches or suggests, "determining the size of the one or more computer instructions, and determining whether the one or more data conversion routines should be generated as stand-alone routines or code chunks based on the size determination." Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact Samir Bhavsar, Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6581.

Applicants hereby attach a separate RCE Transmittal along with a check in the amount of \$790.00 to satisfy the RCE filing fee.

Applicants hereby attach a separate Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 CFR 1.136(a) for responding to the Office Action mailed April 11, 2005 for three (3) months from **August 11, 2005** through **October 11, 2005**. A check in the amount of \$1,020.00 is attached thereto to satisfy the Extension of Time Fee.

Applicants believe no other fee is currently due. However, should there be a fee discrepancy, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Thomas A. Beaton
Reg. No. 46,543

Date: 10/4/05

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer Number: **05073**
Attorney Docket Number: 063170.6285